Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken



Water

Organisation	Date	Reporting Period
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Nairobi (Kenya)	17th August 2015	2014

Activity		2014	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
23716	NAI ACC Sustainable nature management	623.401	African Conservation Center	NGO	Mitigation and Adaptation	Significant	Significant
23856	NAI AWF Biodiversity & livelihoods in Samburu, Amboseli & Mau	2.338.158	African Wildlife Foundation	NGO	Mitigation and Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24214	NAI LWF Conservation & livelihoods in Laikipia	931.567	Laikipia Wildlife Forum	NGO	Mitigation and Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24401	NAI NRT Resilient Conservancies in Northern Kenya	748.524	Northern Rangeland Trust	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24981	NAI WWF Integrated Water Resources Action Plan	767.058	WWF - Kenya	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant

Activity		2014	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
25451	NAI UNESCO IHE Sustainable Water Management Mara River	1.816.540	UNESCO IHE	Research institute and comp	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
16967	NAI UNICEF Kenya WASH programme	3.691.529	UNICEF	Multilateral organization	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24048	NAI VEI Water Operator Partnership Naivasha	583.837	Vitens Evides International	Research institute and comp	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24816	NAI GOAL Sanitation Improvements through Market Strategies	542.601	GOAL	NGO	Not applicable	Significant	Significant
25657	NAI VEI Water Operator Partnership Mombasa	826.928	Vitens Evides International	Research institute and comp	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
26579	KIFFWA	104.800	WASTE (at that time)	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...

Result Area 2	Improved river basin management and safe delta's					
Result Question 2.1a: To what extent has there been progress in the development and implementation of plans for sustainable growth and water safety (incl. good governance) in the target area of your programme?	In Kenya, major sector reforms have been implemented in the last decade, based on the Water Act, 2002. The coming into force of the new Constitution in 2013 required a revision of the existing Water Act and the National Water Policy. The revision process started in 2011 and is ongoing. Important progress was made: in 2014 further consultations between key sector stakeholders and lobbying of parliamentarians took place; additional input into the draft Water Bill and the National Water Policy were given. Subsequently the Water Bill and Draft Water policy went through the 2nd reading in parliament. Pending enactment, the sector continues to operate under the old Water Act 2002 and Policy. The delay in enacting the Act and Policy, however, did not affect the creation and empowerment of 1200 Water Resources User Associations (WRUAs), which has been ongoing since 2008. These Associations fit in very well in the devolution process. In 2014, progress was made at local level as new WRUAs were created and sub-catchment management plans of such Associations were approved and funded. Ongoing is also the revision of all the approved river basin plans.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Number of river basin plans approved and operational.	0 (2005)	6	6	6	6	Ministry of Environment, Water and Nat Res: Annual Water Sector Review Reports 2013/2014
Indicator 2: Number of sub-catchment management plans approved and operational.	0 (2008)	1271	107	234	320	WRMA Performance Report 2014
Indicator 3: Number of Water Resources User Associations operational.	0 (2008)	1271	450	499	571	WRMA Performance Report 2014
Indicator 4: Water storage in m3 per capita .	8 (2008)	16	5	no data available for 2013	data not available	Ministry of Environment, Water and Nat Res: Annual Water Sector Review Reports 2013/2014

Result Question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	The interventions of the Embassy in Nairobi focused on four geographical areas: (i) two catchments emanating from the Mau Forest (Lake Naivasha catchment and Mara River catchment) and (ii) two landscapes in the so-called Semi-Arid Lands (the Laikipia-Samburu-Marsabit landscape and the South Rift Valley landscape). Activities under (i) were initiated and formulated in 2012 and started for Lake Naivasha in 2013 and for the Mara River in 2014. Results in 2014 are limited to the Lake Naivasha area. Activities under (ii) started around mid 2012, after which a baseline was established. Activities are leading to improved management of water and other natural resources (including biodiversity) and improved resilience of pastoralist communities. In the Mau Forest catchments we see continued economic development while biodiversity and ecological values in the catchments are protected. In the semi-arid areas the activities lead to reduced wildlife crime and increased income to pastoralist communities from a range of alternative income sources. In doing so, programmes increase resilience and provide local population with adaptation strategies for the effects of climate change. In 2014, in the Lake Naivasha area, the local office of the water resources management authority and the Water Resources User Assocoiations (WRUAs)					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Water Allocation Plan Lake Naivasha gazetted or amendment(s) gazetted.	0 (2011)	2	0	1	Amendment of plan not available yet.	IWRAP 2014 progress report
Indicator 2: Number of people targeted in the Dutch water management projects.	0 (2011)	747,500 (Naivasha)	0	747,500	747,500	IWRAP 2014 progress report
Indicator 3: Number of farmers in Lake Naivasha basin involved in downstream - upstream payment for environmental services that are implementing sustainable land use practices	565 (2011)	3000	785	1285	1438	IWRAP 2014 Project progress report
Indicator 4: Area under conservation management in semi-arid project area (in ha)	3,253,863 (2012)	3,300,000	3,253,863	2,819,885	3,306,020	Project progress reports

More indicators

Result Area 2	Improved river basin management and safe delta's					
Result Question 2.2a: To what extent has transboundary and collective river basin management been improved in the target area of your programme?	Kenya has 5 international trans-boundary river basins. The government has over the past years been developing its Transboundary Water Policy. By the end of 2014 the policy was approved by the Attorney General (AG) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (MFA). Kenya is presently finalising the signing of bilateral MoUs with the neighbouring counries (Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Uganda). Kenya has been taking part in negotiations around the Nile basin, and is the process of ratifying the Nile Corporative Framework Agreement. Kenya and Ethiopia in collaboration with UNEP have initiated a regional project on the sustainable management of Lake Turkana and its River Basins. The project document has been signed by the two countries (and by UNEP in 2015). The Embassy actively lobbied for the involvement of the Netherlands Commission on Impact Assessment in this project. The two remaining MoUs (indicator 1) are between Kenya and Uganda and Kenya and Tanzania.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicators 1: No of bilateral transboundary MoUs	0(2008)	3	drafting ongoing	1 MoU signed (Between Kenya and Tanzania	Remaining 2 MoUs awaiting Ministerial signature	Ministry of Environment, Water & Natural Resources-Annual Water Sector Review Report (2013/2014)
Indicators 2: Kenyan Transboundary Waters Policy in place	0(2008)	1	Drafting	Final draft prepared after consultations	Final draft approved by AG and MFA end 2014	Ministry of Environment, Water & Natural Resources-Annual Water Sector Review Report (2013/2014)
Indicators...						
Indicators...						

Result Question 2.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	In June 2014, the Embassy-funded Mau Mara Serengeti (MaMaSe) Sustainable Water Initiative by UNESCO-IHE commenced its implementation after a 6 months inception phase. The aim of this project is to improve water safety and security in the Mara River Basin (MRB) in support of structural poverty reduction, sustainable economic growth, and conservation of the basin, forest and rangeland ecosystems. The benefits from this project will inevitably spill over to neighbouring Tanzania, which shares the Mara river. So far, 3 WRUAs were capacity built on development of Sub-catchment management plans; all 3 are currently in draft, awaiting input from stakeholders, 3 farmer cooperatives were trained to improve agronomics and enviromental performance of farmers and 314 small scale farmers (ecosystem services sellers) and 3 ecosystem services buyers have been enrolled to the pilot PES scheme in the sub-catchment. The scheme which is still in the initial stages was launched in October 2014 with great support from the Bomet County Government.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Number of farmers in Mara River basin involved in downstream - upstream payment for environmental services that are implementing sustainable land use practices	150 (2013)	300	150	150	314	Project reports
Indicator 2: Water Allocation Plan Mara River Basin gazetted or amendment(s) / updat(s) gazetted	0 (2013)	1	0	0	development ongoing	Project reports
Indicator 3: Number of people (male/female) targeted in the Dutch water management projects.	0 (2013)	650.000 (Mara river basin)	0	0	0	Project reports

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 2	Improved river basin management and safe delta's:
B. Results achieved as planned Reasons for result achieved:	The current phase of the Lake Naivasha Integrated Water Resource Management project commenced in 2013. In 2014 the implementation of activities went on well albeit with afew delays of which fast tracking measures were identified. Also in 2014 the project experienced unexpected staff transfer at the local water resources management authority,however based on the past experience a back-up strategy had been developed to prevent activity disruptions from occuring. The Mara River Basin project commenced its implementation phase in June 2014 and the progress is picking up slowly but steadily.
Implications for planning:	Project implementation is generally on track. Where there has been reported delays the project implementing partners have indicated clear fast-tracking actions to be undertaken in 2015.

Result Area 3	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)
Result Question 3.1a: How many people (male/female) have gained sustainable access an improved water source or improved sanitairy facility and to what extent has governance been imporved on this topic in the target area of your programme?	The Constitution devolved water supply and sanitation services provision to the county level. In the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, all Kenyans are guaranteed the right to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation. By end of 2014 the new revised Water Bill and draft Water Policy had not yet been enacted and gazetted. The delay in the enactment/gazetment of the Water Bill and draft policy created unclarity regarding the future of the institutional set-up for service provision at the county level. This delay also has the risk of the water services sub-sector losing the gains realized from the reforms of 2002 (such as ring-fencing water financing for Operation and Maintenance). The Water Bill and draft Water policy have undergone 2nd reading in parliament in 2014; enactment is envisaged in the second half of 2015. In the meantime the county government has 100% ownership of the water utilities. Despite the uncertainties, the government and donors continued investment in providing access to safe drinking water and sanitation in 2014 by investing in rural and urban areas. Progress on the indicators in 2014 was limited, especially in urban areas where the numbers of households is increasing more rapidly than the number of households with access to safe drinking water and sanitation. The progress on sanitation - especially sewerage - has been poor over the last 25 years, due to high costs of urban sewerage and large urban slum populations. This has resulted to on-site sanitation for urban sanitation. Initiatives to involve private sector in

	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Source
Indicator 1: Proportion of the urban population using improved drinking water sources	92% (1990)	98%	83% (2011)	82% (2012)	65.4%	Previous; WHO / UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme Current; Annual water sector review report 2013/2014
Indicator 2: Proportion of the rural population using improved drinking water sources	33% (1990)	66%	54% (2011)	55% (2011)	48.8%	Previous; WHO / UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme Current; Annual water sector review report 2013/2014
Indicator 3: Proportion of the urban population using an improved sanitation faciltiy	26% (1990)	63%	31% (2011)	31% (2012)	72.2%	Previous; WHO / UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme Current; Annual water sector review report 2013/2014
Indicator 4: Proportion of the rural population using an improved sanitation faciltiy	24% (1990)	62%	29% (2011)	29% (2012)	66%	Previous; WHO / UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme Current; Annual water sector review report 2013/2014

Result Question 3.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	The interventions of the Embassy in Nairobi focus on three areas: (i) rural water and sanitation through the UNICEF Kenya WASH programme in 22 counties (since 2008); (ii) support to two Water Operator Partnership Programmes (WOPs) between Dutch drinking water companies and Kenyan urban water service providers in Naivasha and Mombasa; (iii) support to the development of private sector solutions for sanitation in slums through implementation of the sanitation improvement through market strategies project. For areas (ii) and (iii), 2014 was the 2nd full year of operation. Private sector involvement is strongly supported, also in sanitation. (i) In the rural UNICEF programme, 2014 was the phasing out year. Implementation was therefore mainly focused on completing already started projects. A verification and sustainability check study was also undertaken in 2014. As a result 97% of the 1236 projects were confirmed to exist in the officially documented locations. The rest of the projects were not visited due to various reasons including; projects not implemented, projects abandoned, duplication/errors in documentation and security issues. With regards to sustainability, 23% of the completed and visited projects were not operational.

	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Source
Indicator 1 : Number of people with access to sustainable and safe drinking water in rural areas	430.000 additional (2011)	1.600.000 additional	960.000 additional	963.000 additional	833.450 additional	UNICEF project progress report 2014
Indicator 2 : Number of people with access to acceptable sanitation in rural areas	480.000 additional (2010)	2.800.000 additional	1.210.000 additional	1.867.310 additional	1.974.850 additional	UNICEF project progress report 2014.
Indicator 3 : additional number of people with access to sustainable and safe drinking water in urban areas of Naivasha and Mombasa	0 (2010)	144.000	0	37,108 (Naivasha. May 2014)	44.000 (Naivasha)	Naiv WOP; 2014 project progress reports
Indicator 4 : additional number of people with access to acceptable sanitation in urban areas of Naivasha and Mombasa	0 (2010)	38.000 (2016)	0	15,634 (Naivasha, May, 2014)	128.000 (Naivasha)	Naiv WOP; 2014 project progress reports

Result Area 3	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)
Result Question 3.2a: To what extent have water management aspects and a more business oriented way of working been applied in your WASH programmes.	Since the enactment of the Water Act 2002, the Kenyan water services adopted provision of urban water supply and sewerage by independent, commercially operating Water Service Providers. Water companies are registered under the Company Act and use water tariffs to finance their Operation and Maintenance. A number of water service providers have succeeded in becoming more professional, but many, especially the small companies are still ineffective, and not commercially viable. Non Revenue Water (water that is produced but is not generating revenue) and service hours are still below the standards set by the regulator, the Kenya Water Service Regulatory Board. WASREB is considered to be effective and a key player in the (success of the) water sector reform. It sets, monitors and enforces service provision standards for improved governance in the sector. WASREB collects information on the commercialized approaches of Water Service Providers and publishes annual reports with information on the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of all urban and some rural Water Service Providers. For two indicators, notable %-age of Non Revenue Water and Hours of water provision / day, the national trend has been stagnant or marginally positive according to the last available data (2013). In rural areas, water supply and sanitation are mostly community-led. In rural sanitation, the so-called Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) approach, targeting

	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Source
Indicator 1 : Percentage of water produced by water utilities that does not generate revenu (Non Revenue Water)	43% (2009)	25%	45% (2011)	57% (2012)	55%	Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report
Indicator 2 : Average number of hours / day of water provision in urban service areas (national average)	15 (2009)	20	13 (2011)	15 (2012)	17(2013)	Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report
Indicator 3 : # of Open Defecation Free villages country-wide	0 (2009)	6.600	1.838	3.886	16.817	Ministry of Public Health / UNICEF
Indicator 4: % of water revenues used for Operation and Maintenance by urban Water Service Providers	133% (2010)	150%	118% (2011) - revised figure	105% (2012):	104% (2013)	Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report

Result Question 3.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	In the UNICEF programme the Embassy has actively lobbied UNICEF to incorporate mechanisms that improve the sustainability of the interventions, i.a. by involving the private sector. This includes training of local (private) mechanics that may provide services to communities when pumps break down. In partnerhsip with SNV there has been continuous modelling of various Public Private Partnerships for enhancing sustainability of rural water supplies as a result 7 Private Public Community Partnerships piloted. 7county governments adopted PPP in their water sector strategic plans, and 3 drafted policies that allow private sector participation. Under the sanitation and hygiene component in the UNICEF project, 1,270 villages attained Open Defecation Free (ODF) status with 381,000 new users of household latrines. The total number of school children with safe water and sanitation, separate for boys and girls is 278,101(59%) out of the 473,000 planned. In the Water Operator Partnerships the main attention is towards improving the financial, institutional,environmental, technical and social aspects of the water

	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Source
Indicator 1 : Non Revenue Water in Naivasha town	50% (2011)	33%	50% (2011)	No data (2012)	44%	Previous; Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report Current; 2014 project progress report
Indicator 2 : Non Revenue Water (NRW) in Mombasa town	42% (2011)	15%	42% (2011)	47% (2012)	50%	Previous; Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report Current; 2014 project progress report
Indicator 3 : Average number of hours / day of water provision in Naivasha	2 hrs/ day (2011)	12 hrs/ day (2016)	2 hrs/ day (2011)	6 hrs/day (2012)	6hrs/day	Previous;Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report Current; 2014 project progress report
Indicator 4 : Average number of hours / day of water provision in Mombasa	8 hrs / day (2010)	16 hrs / day (2016)	8 hrs / day (2011)	6 hrs/day (2012)	6hrs/ 3-4 days per week	Previous; Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report Current; 2014 project progress report

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 3	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH).
C. Results achieved poorer than planned Reasons for result achieved:	Results for rural WaSH are behind schedule as UNICEF had various challenges in the implementation of the project. Initial targets were revised downwards in a phase-out plan. And a project evaluation will be carried out in July to ascertain the impacts so far. The WOP partnerships carried on with implementation of interventions. Naivasha experienced a change in the water utility's management, a management that is eager to bring about a change in the company. Mombasa similarly had a change in the water utility's management, but the interim management ineffective. The non-revenue water for Mombasa increased which was mainly due to not only old meters and illegal connections/water theft, but also due to commercial losses. There has been closer involvement of the Mombasa county government (charged with the mandate to ensure adequate water provision in its jurisdiction) which is keen to see reforms and the establishment of a revamped water utility.
Implications for planning:	Rural WaSH: the Dutch contribution came to an end by close of 2014. A sustainability and verification census was done in 2014 to evaluate the level of sustainability of the programme. A project evaluation will be carried out in 2015 to acertain the level of impact. For the Water Partnerships it is expected that in 2015 more progress will be realised. The NRW is one of the main focus areas of the WOP. Interventions on NRW are therefore expected to be upscaled. Especially in Mombasa, where the WOP project has entered into an MoU with World Bank and the County government to expand the NRW interventions, and due to this the Embassy offered the project an extension. Counties Governments are keen to see that water service provision is improved in their county - this has been the case in Mombasa county. In the case of Naivasha, the Managing Director has been replaced in order to improve management of the company.

Result Area 4	Trade and Development Cooperation					
Result Question 4.1a: How has the added value (knowledge, expertise, products and services) of the Dutch water sector been deployed in the preparation and implementation of programmes in the water sector?	Increasingly, many of the Dutch funding instruments, including the embassy funding, are moving towards a more trade driven collaboration in development cooperation, and less of aid driven collaboration. Much of the Dutch funding is now meant for Public-Private Partnership (PPP). The Kenyan water sector now benefits from the added value, from several of these Dutch PPPs, in the areas of non-revenue water, financial management, technologies for efficient waste management, among other areas.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Number of Dutch water sector actors active in the water sector in Kenya (by Companies, NGO's, Knowledge Institutes and Drinking water companies + Water Authorities.	10 (2010)	50	not measured, approximately 30	51	54	Netherlands Embassy Nairobi
Indicator...						
Indicator...						
Indicator...						

Result Question 4.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	The embassy is supporting projects in water services provision and water resources management where Dutch added value through knowledge transfer is being realised. The Lake Naivasha integrated water resources management project, The Mau Mara Sustainable Water Initiative, the WOPs in the Naivasha and Mombasa water companies are such projects. The Water Operator Partnerships (WOPs) in particular significantly contribute towards improving the financial, institutional,environmental, technical and social aspects of the water services (water supply and sanitation). The same applies to the IWRM projects, which facilitate the transfer of knowledge and expertise through capacity building interventions with the local stakeholders. In 2014 12 Dutch partners were actively involved in the water program: 3 Private Sector (Mara Farming, Aquanet, HSBC bank), 2 NGO's (SNV, WGC), 3 Knowledge Institutes (WUR, ITC, UNESCO-IHE, 1 Water Company (Vitens) and 3 Water Authorities (Stichtse Rijnlanden, Noorderzijlvest, Waterschap Brabantse Delta)					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Number of Dutch water sector actors directly involved in preparation and implementation of Dutch funded programs (by Companies, NGO's, Knowledge Institutes and Drinking water	0 (2010)	10	4	7	12 (3 PS, 2 NGO, 3 KI, 1 WC, 3 WA)	Netherlands Embassy Nairobi
Indicator...						
Indicator...						
Indicator...						

Result Area 4	Trade and Development Cooperation					
Result Question 4.2a: What are the results of the transition to a more trade related relationship in the water sector?	It should be noted that the transition to more trade related relationship in the water sector is not a Kenyan policy priority. Being a Dutch priority, the information contained here is linked only to Dutch aid and trade. In 2013, at least 51 Dutch water actors were active in Kenya. Only 13 of these actors (25%) did not receive any contribution from the Dutch Government via the Dutch Financing Instruments (ORIO, PSI, PvW), centrally funded water projects, MFS, NUFFIC NICHE, the Sustainable Water Fund (FDW) or WOTRO/ Ministry of Education. Of the 13 non-subsidized actors, 5 are NGOs and 8 are private companies. For 2014 a comprehensive overview is lacking.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Ratio between active Dutch water sector actors with / without Dutch Government funding	unknown	40%	unknown	25% (13/51)	no data available	NWP/ MoFA/ Netherlands Embassy Nairobi
Indicator...						
Indicator...						
Indicator...						

Result Question 4.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	The Embassy programme identified in its MASP 2014-2017 the need to promote innovative financing for the water sector in Kenya. A facility for innovative water financing will be developed in 2014 and will be launched in 2015. It will facilitate water financing but not provide finance itself. In combination with the availability of Dutch financing instruments (PSI, ORIO, DRIVE and DGGF) this should lead to strategic Dutch investments in the water sector in Kenya. In 2014 the so called 'water box' was introduced in Mara Farming by Land Life as part of the MaMaSe project. Maji Milele (water forever) got registered as a private pre paid water system provider.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Number of existing strategic Dutch investments in the water sector in which the embassy has had a brokerage, advisory or programmatic role.	0 (2012)	5 (annually)	1	3	5	Netherlands Embassy Nairobi
Indicator...						
Indicator...						
Indicator...						

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 4	Trade and Development Cooperation
B. Results achieved as planned Reasons for result achieved:	The joint agenda of Trade and Development Cooperation was initiated in the MASP 2012-2015 in Kenya and has led to an increased number of Dutch actors active in Kenya . However, most of these actors depend on Dutch Government funding.
Implications for planning:	In the next years, the Embassy programme for water will further focus on facilitating the use of Dutch expertise. New and upcoming Embassy funded programs, which are Kenya Innovative Financing Facility for Water and the Smart Water for Agriculture, will facilitate blending of private sector funding and funding from international financial institutions, also with the aim to replace donor funding in the coming years.

bis@minbuza.nl

Result Area 2 (remaining indicators)	Improved river basin management and safe delta's					
Result Question 2.1a: To what extent has there been progress in the development and implementation of plans for sustainable growth and water safety. (incl. good governance) in the target area of your programme?						
	Baseline	**Target**	**Result**	**Result**	**Result**	**Source**
Indicator 5 : Forest cover (in % of total area)	6.5% (1990)	10% (constitution)	6.1% (2010)	6.1% (2010)	6.1% (2010)	UNSTAT MDG indicators
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?						
	Baseline	**Target**	**Result**	**Result**	**Result**	**Source**
Indiactor 5: Number of elephants killed by poaching in the semi-arid project area.	385 (2012)	0	385	118	76	Project progress reports.
Indicator 6: Number of officially recorded incidents as a consequence of natural resource conflicts in the semi-arid project area.	254 (2012)	50	254	143	1140	Partners reports. Strong increase mainly due to ethnic strife in the North (as well as improved monitoring capacity by NRT).
Indicator 7: Amount of income generated in non-livestock livelihoods in the semi-arid project area (in Kenya shillings).	324.045.000 (2012)	600.000.000	324.045.000	571.165.908	1.136.638.045	Partners reports.
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 2